UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,874	10/04/2005	Lennart Angquist	43315-218154	6711

26694 7590 03/14/2007

VENABLE LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER	
LAXTON, GARY L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2838	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/533,874	ANGQUIST, LENNART	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary L. Laxton	2838	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive even though the claims are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant believes the phrase "a power source at ground potential" distinguishes the prior art. Figure 7 of Cheng et al. disclose the ground potential at 40.

The applicant also believes the phrase "auxiliary power supply" distinguishes the prior art. The recitation "auxiliary power supply" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Moreover, the applicant appears to rely on the phrase "high potential" as distinguishing the prior art. The claims provide no standard or definition as to what applicant claims is "high". Therefore, the examiner considers the voltage of Cheng et al. to be at "high" potential.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., high voltage potential of the transmission line and operating an inverter in case of a power failure on the power line) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Lastly, as pointed out in the last office action, Cheng et al. disclose a transmission link that includes at least tow current paths each closed by a capacitive coupling to provide insulation between the ground potential and a "high" potential ( ).

Therefore, having readily dismissed the applicant's arguments, the examiner maintains the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 13-16, 18, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng et al.

Cheng et al discloses a power source (e.g. 41), a load circuit (e.g. 32), and a transmission link (e.g. 30, 31) for coupling the power source to the load circuit, wherein the power source comprises a high frequency voltage generator (e.g. 40), the transmission link comprises a first and a second current path (e.g. 36, 38, 42), each path being closed by capacitive coupling (e.g.

36) to provide insulation between the ground potential and the high potential, and each current path having a reactive compensation means (42) for series compensation of reactive power generated by the capacitive coupling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Peng et al.

Cheng et al. disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claim 1 except for the capacitive coupling is provided by a stray capacitance.

Peng et al. teach relying on stray capacitance in lieu of discrete capacitors and/or inductors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cheng et al. to provide the capacitive coupling by a stray capacitance as taught by Peng et al. in order to reduce manufacturing cost by reducing the discrete component count.

6. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. and Peng et al. in view of Hwang et al.

Cheng et al. disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 1 and 13 supra, except for the wherein the voltage generator is capacitively coupled.

Hwang et al, figure 5, teaches isolating circuit subsystems through the use of coupling capacitors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cheng et al. and Peng et al. to capacitively couple the voltage generator as taught by Peng et al. to protect the generator through isolation from the capacitors.

7. Claims 8, 10, 11, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Hwang et al.

Claims 8, 10, and 20; Cheng et al. disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 1 and 13 supra, except for the wherein the load circuit is capacitively coupled and wherein the voltage generator is capacitively coupled.

Hwang et al., figure 5, teaches isolating circuit subsystems through the use of coupling capacitors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cheng et al. to capacitively couple the voltage generator or the load circuit as taught by Hwang et al. to protect the circuits through isolation from the capacitors.

Claims 10 and 22; Cheng et al. discloses how the inductors are coupled to each other through (42).

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Bors (US 6,552,919).

Cheng et al disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claim 1 except for wherein the load circuit is comprises a transformer with the secondary winding coupled to an AC/DC converter.

Bors teaches a load circuit having a transformer (106) with a second winding coupled to an AC/DC converter (108) to provide DC power to a DC load from an AC source.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cheng et al to include a load circuit with a transformer having the secondary coupled to an AC/DC converter as taught by Bors to provide DC power to a DC load from an AC source.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary L. Laxton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on (571) 272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gary L. Laxton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2838

3/72007